

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

ERIC D. STEPHENSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	4:14CV3097
)	
v.)	
)	
DAVID BRUNO, et al.,)	MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

The above-captioned matter was provisionally filed on May 12, 2014 (Filing No. [1](#)). However, due to certain technical defects, the complaint cannot be further processed. To assure further consideration of the complaint, plaintiff must correct the defect listed below. **FAILURE TO CORRECT THE DEFECT MAY RESULT IN DISMISSAL OF THE COMPLAINT.**

Plaintiff has failed to include the \$400.00 filing and administrative fees. Plaintiff has the choice of either tendering the \$400.00 fees to the clerk of the court or submitting a request to proceed in forma pauperis and an affidavit of poverty in support thereof. If plaintiff chooses to do the latter, the enclosed pauper's forms should be completed and returned to the Court.

IT IS ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff is directed to correct the above-listed technical defect within 30 days of the date of this Memorandum and Order.
2. Failure to comply with this Memorandum and Order will result in dismissal of this matter without further notice.

3. The clerk of the court is directed to send to plaintiff the Form AO240, Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Affidavit.

4. The clerk of the court is directed to set a pro se case management deadline in this matter with the following text:
June 16, 2014: Check for MIFP or payment.

DATED this 16th day of May, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Lyle E. Strom

LYLE E. STROM, Senior Judge
United States District Court

* This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the Court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The Court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the Court.